

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/697,666	10/29/2003	John David Stanley Stanier	UT10152003	8392
	7590 03/25/2004		EXAMINER	
MORRISON & FOERSTER, LLP 555 WEST FIFTH STREET SUITE 3500 LOS ANGELES, CA 90013-1024			MILLER, BENA B	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3712	

DATE MAILED: 03/25/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

,	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Commence	10/697,666	STANIER, JOHN DAVID STANLE			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Bena Miller	3712			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	i6(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days ill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication.			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	· •				
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ This action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowan					
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	3 O.G. 213.			
Disposition of Claims					
4) Claim(s) 16-28 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 16-28 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	n from consideration.				
Application Papers	·				
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.					
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accel					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the dr					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Exa	n is required if the drawing(s) is obje miner. Note the attached Office A	ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). Action or form PTO-152.			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign p a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau (* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of 	have been received. have been received in Application y documents have been received (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	n No I in this National Stage			
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4)	PTO-413)			
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date Statement Technology Stateme	Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5) Notice of Informal Pate 6) Other:	D			

Application/Control Number: 10/697,666

Art Unit: 3712

DETAILED ACTION

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 16-28 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-11 of U.S. Patent No. 6,688,940. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other but may be missing certain elements such as the left arm member extends vertically downward to about the waist and terminates with a horizontal surface and the horizontal waist defines a gap which allows the left arm member to fit over an armrest, the right arm member contiguously connected along a substantial portion of the right side of the torso member, the right arm member extends vertically downward to about the waist and terminates with a horizontal surface and the horizontal surface and waist defines a gap which allows the right arm member to fit over another armrest. On the other hand, it would have been obvious to modify the device claimed in the patent for the purpose of inflating a shaped object.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim16-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claims 16 and 23, the examiner is not sure if applicant is claiming the combination of the three-dimensional apparatus and the seat or the subcombination of the three-dimensional apparatus. This in turn, is because while line 1 of the claim appears to indicate that applicant's intention is to claim only the three-dimensional apparatus, other claims recite limitations that are dependent on the seat. (Note claim 17, for example only). In this Office Action, the examiner presumes that applicant's intention is to prosecute the subcombination of the operating device, in order that the claims are given their broadest reasonable interpretation. Accordingly, all additional limitations that are dependent on the seat are not considered further structurally limiting with respect to the claimed apparatus.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

⁽b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Application/Control Number: 10/697,666

Art Unit: 3712

Claims 16-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Rizzo.

Regarding claims 16 and 23, Rizzo teaches in the figures a three-dimensional apparatus comprising at least one life-sized inflatable humanoid figure (1), a means (32), a head member (fig. 1), a neck member (fig.1) and a torso (fig.1).

The examiner takes the position that Rizzo teach all of the functional recitations of claim 17.

Regarding claims 18 and 24, Rizzo teaches the angle is approximately a right angle (fig.2).

Regarding claims 19, 21, 25 and 27, Rizzo further teaches human characteristic means ate least one facial feature means (fig.1 and 2).

Regarding claims 20, 22, 26 and 28, Rizzo further teaches the accourrement means (50, 70).

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Pietrafesa teaches a soft baby doll.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bena Miller whose telephone number is 703.305.0643. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

Application/Control Number: 10/697,666

Art Unit: 3712

Page 5

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Bena Miller Examiner

Art Unit 3712

bbm

March 17,2004